

Appl. No. 09/817,917

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections, as well as reconsideration of the finality of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 21-24, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,331) was maintained. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants maintain that Alexander does not teach or suggest all of the elements of this claim as argued in Applicants' previous response filed on November 4, 2004. Furthermore, in response to the arguments presented in the present final Office Action, Applicants submit the following arguments addressing each of these arguments as they relate to claim 1.

In paragraph 3.1 of the Office Action, the assertion is made that Alexander indeed teaches the claimed element of "access to a discrete data component from a data source." In support, col. 4, lines 44-49 and col. 12, lines 12-14, as well as Figure 1 of Alexander are cited as teaching this element. The cited sections, however, merely speak to the fact that Alexander discloses a content management framework to manage the arrangement, composition, and display attributes of web page content and that Extensible Markup Language (XML) content is persisted to a file while metadata about the content is stored in the database 21. These sections, however, do not actually teach "access to a discrete component of data from at least one data source," but actually relate to pushing content to a file or database, not accessing the content from a data source.

Appl. No. 09/817,917

Furthermore, in paragraph 3.2 of the present Office Action, the assertion is made that Alexander discloses the claimed element of "associating [the] at least one discrete component of data with at least one domain." The Office Action refers to col. 6, lines 58-63 of Alexander as allegedly disclosing this claimed element. This referenced section of Alexander, however, is actually disclosing that the content management framework 18 is logically categorized into Content Management Framework (CMF) form classes and three groups of classes relating to controls, validators, and adaptors. Alexander specifically discusses these form classes and groups of classes in the four paragraphs following this cited section. As may be seen, these paragraphs do not specifically teach actually associating a discrete component of data with at least one domain. Rather, these are classes representational of a framework object model (e.g., FIG. 5). Although this teaching may obliquely "disclose grouping of data and the classes or categories for storage within database [sic]" as alleged in the Office Action, this is not tantamount to an actual teaching of the claimed feature of "associating discrete data components with at least one domain."

Moreover, paragraph 3.3 of the present Office Action asserts that the claimed element of "adding domain specific contextual information to set at least one discrete component of data to provide enhanced data" is also taught by Alexander. In particular, the Office Action alleges that Alexander discloses a piece of content, that is a data component, combined with metadata, which is equated with the claimed "contextual information." In support, col. 2, lines 49-52 of Alexander and col. 6, lines 23-26 are proffered as teaching this element. Despite this assertion, Applicant submit that Alexander does not teach or suggest, even in the referenced sections, that metadata is actually added to a discrete component of data to provide enhanced data. Rather, the metadata as disclosed in the referenced section of col. 6, lines 23-26, is stored in its own

Appl. No. 09/817,917

metadata layer 41, which, although related to other information, is still separate (i.e., not added to) the information. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that Alexander does not in fact teach this element. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectively request that the rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn, as Alexander does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claim.

With respect to claims 2-6, these claims are also allowable on their merits and for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, from which these claims depend. Additionally, Applicants reiterate that Alexander also does not teach or suggest the provision of enhanced data by adding contextual information to discrete data that has been accessed from a source. Thus, the features of assigning access rights to enhanced data in claim 2, assigning usage rules to enhanced data in claim 3, and encoding enhanced data with a markup language in claim 4 necessarily would not be taught by Alexander.

With respect to independent claim 9, this claim features the element of "receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data from a request, the enhanced data including added contextual information." As argued previously, Alexander does not teach or suggest the addition of contextual information to achieve enhanced data. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, with respect to claims 10 and 12, which depend from claim 9, these claims are also believed to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency.

With regard to claim 21, the Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses all of the claimed elements. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 21, in particular, features "at least one discrete component of data," "first contextual information that enhances...[the] discrete component of data for a first domain," "second contextual information that enhances...[the]

Appl. No. 09/817,917

discrete component for a second domain,” and “the first domain [being] different from the second domain.” The Office Action relies on the teaching in lines 49-67 in column 2 of Alexander as teaching these elements. Once again, however, Applicants submit that this section of Alexander merely teaches separate data entries, each having an accompanying set of information attributes describing the data entry element. This teaching is not the same as the claimed features because each data entry element includes within the metadata form a set of information attributes describing the respective data entry elements. In contrast, claim 21 features first and second contextual information enhancing at least one discrete component of data for respective first and second domains. That is, claim 21 features at least two types of contextual information that enhance the same at least one discrete component of data whereas Alexander is merely teaching a respective set of information attributes for each data entry element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Alexander does not teach the elements of claim 21.

With respect to dependent claims 22-26, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and also for at least the reasons presented with respect to independent claim 21.

Claims 27 and 28 include elements similar to the elements found in claims 1 and 9, respectively. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 9 and also on their own merits.

Claims 7, 14, 15 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Bell, et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 20020120501). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 7, Applicants first note that this claim was previously rejected in the last Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Alexander. No

Appl. No. 09/817,917

amendments have been made to this claim yet the present Office Action has finally rejected claim 7 on new grounds. Accordingly, this new ground of rejection was not necessitated by any amendment on Applicants' part and thus the final rejection of this claim was premature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the present Office Action be withdrawn, accordingly.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either combined or taken separately, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 7. In particular, claim 1, from which this claim depends, is first believed to be allowable and thus, claim 7 is also allowable.

Additionally, the cited section in Bell concerning the alleged teaching of processing "feedback information within a content management system" simply does not teach the claimed elements of claim 7. Specifically, Bell teaches receiving "feedback" that consists of comments from recording artists, not feedback data. Notwithstanding, even if one could characterize the taught "feedback" discussed in Bell as feedback data, Bell nonetheless does not disclose the claimed element of "modifying the enhanced data to include the feedback data." Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Bell nor Alexander teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 7 and the rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to Claims 14 and 15, these claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on independent claim 9, discussed above, as well as on their own merits.

With respect to Claim 25, which depends from Claim 21, neither claim 21 nor claim 25 was amended in the last amendment, yet the present Office Action has issued a new rejection under §103, thus changing the rejection without any amendments that would have necessitated such a change. Accordingly, the finality of this rejection is believed to be in error and the

Appl. No. 09/817,917

finality should be withdrawn, accordingly. Additionally, claim 25 is believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependency on claim 21 and also according to its merits.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being patentable over Alexander in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is allowable due to its dependency on independent claim 1 and also on its merits. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 13, 16-18, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Muyres, et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 20010010046). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 11 and 13, these claims are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependency on independent claim 9, discussed previously, and also on their merits. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to independent claim 16, the Applicants first point out that this claim was previously rejected in the last Office Action under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Alexander. Although this claim was amended in Applicant's last response, the amendment to this claim merely amounted to the addition of a semicolon to cure a typographical error and no substantive changes were made to this claim. The grounds for rejecting this claim was nonetheless changed and made final. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amendment to this claim did not necessitate a new rejection that could be made final. Accordingly, the finality of this rejection is not proper and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, with respect to the new substantive rejection of claim 16, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Alexander and Muyres does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 16. In particular, claim 16 features, among other things, "filtering the

Appl. No. 09/817,917

content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule.” Additionally, the claim features “receiving content from [the] at least one entity that includes terms of said at least one service.” The Office Action alleges in Paragraphs 3.4 and 3.6, as well as in the new 103 rejection of claim 16, that Muyres teaches these elements. The cited sections of Muyres, however, appear to fail to teach the specific claimed elements. Particularly, the “filtering” taught by Muyres is actually the provision of proprietary outside services to “filter” fraud from customers, as discussed in Paragraph [0209] or the use of proxies that “filter” providing security as discussed in Paragraph [0386]. This teaching is not the same as the claimed filtering of actual content to determine if the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule.

Furthermore, neither Alexander or Muyres teach receiving content from at least one entity including terms of at least one service. The present Office Action argues that Muyres teaches this element in Paragraphs [0159], [0166] and [0191]. Although these paragraphs generally discuss processing services within a content management and distribution system, none of the cited paragraphs of Muyres actually teaches that content is received where the content includes terms of service. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Muyres does not teach this element for which it is alleged as teaching.

In light of the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is allowable over the cited prior art of record.

With respect to dependent claims 17 and 18, which depend from claim 16, these claims are also believed to be allowable on their merits and at least due to their dependency on independent claim 16.

With respect to claim 29, this claim was not at all amended in Applicants’ last amendment, yet a new, final rejection under 103 was issued. Accordingly, the Applicants

Appl. No. 09/817,917

respectfully submit that the finality of this rejection was premature and the finality should be withdrawn, accordingly.

Additionally, with respect to the substantive rejection of claim 29 under §103(e), Applicants note this claim includes features similar to those found in claim 16; namely, receiving content including terms of at least one service and filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claim 29 is also allowable over Alexander and Muyres for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 16.

With respect to claim 30, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 30. In particular, the office action asserts that Alexander teaches, among other things, "adding domain specific contextual information to set at least one discrete component of data by the second entity to create enhanced data." As argued previously in this response, Alexander does not actually teach adding contextual information to a discrete component of data in order to create enhanced data. Accordingly, Alexander cannot be relied upon as teaching this element. Additionally, Muyres does not make up for this deficiency.

With respect to dependent claims 31 and 32, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency on independent claim 30.

With respect to Claims 19 and 20, rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander and Muyres as applied to claim 16 and further in view of Bowman-Amuah. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and also the finality of this rejection. Claims 19 and 20 are original claims and depend from claim 16, which was not amended in any substantive manner. Accordingly, the finality of this newly presented rejection is premature as previously

Appl. No. 09/817,917

argued above with respect to claim 16. Additionally, these claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claim 16 and also are believed allowable on their merits.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Additionally, the finality of the present Office Action is believed to have been erroneous as new rejections were presented concerning claims that were either not amended or not amended in a substantive manner. Thus, Applicants request the finality of the present office action be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request, nonetheless, a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Patrick B. Law

Registration No. 41,549

Date: June 8, 2005

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005